

Phase II

Creating the Neighborhood Plan

One of the key features of the November 1996 Big Event was a display describing the Phase II planning process and soliciting interested people to participate in Phase II and other future activities.

Preparation for Phase II

Immediately after the Big Event, MoCA began preparing for Phase II with a community workshop on December 9, 1996. Following a presentation of the results of the issue validation process (described above), participants divided into small groups by topic to discuss the structure of the Phase II Planning Committee and work groups, to answer questions, and to complete forms expressing their interest in participating in Phase II. Approximately 35 people attended this workshop; 26 signed up for the Phase II Planning Committee.

The Organizing Committee reviewed the applications and presented the applicants to the public at the MoCA general meeting on January 9, 1997. The names of all 26 candidates were submitted for public approval at the MoCA general meeting on February 13, 1997. Validation consisted of a public vote to approve or disapprove the entire slate of candidates; the slate was approved by a margin of 27 to 1.

The Phase II Planning Committee began meeting on February 27, 1997. Over the next three months, they met several times to (1) develop a strong decision-making structure and communications procedures and (2) begin the task of putting together a work plan for Phase II. In March 1997, the Committee held a half-day planning retreat, which provided an excellent opportunity to bring new members up to date on Phase I activities and for all members to discuss the Phase II scope of work.

The Phase II Planning Committee initially consisted of a chair and 14 members, including the chairs of the six topical subcommittees (Transportation/Traffic, Housing/Land-Use, Business District, Parks/Open Space, Community/Culture/Human Services, and Public Safety). At the time it was formed, all stakeholder groups were represented on the Planning Committee.

The initial committee structure proved unwieldy in practice and too much work fell on the shoulders of the chair. These problems, coupled with attrition, led to a reorganization of the Planning Committee into two co-chairs and seven members, including the heads of each of the topical subcommittees.

The Committee hired a consultant, Carlson Architects, to assist with the Process of creating a Scope of Work and Work Plan for Phase II, and to coordinate consultant support for the topical subcommittees and ongoing outreach activities. The Neighborhood Planning Office also provided specific assistance during this time period, especially in defining the steps needed to prepare the draft Neighborhood Plan which would be presented to the City departments for review,

Outreach and education continued during Phase II as well, with several MoCA meetings devoted to specific neighborhood planning topics of interest, such as housing, land-use, and transportation issues. Comments received at these meetings were considered during the next step of the process, creation of the final Goals, Policies and Recommendations of the Morgan Junction Neighborhood Plan.

Goals and Policies

Each topical subcommittee again sifted through all the Phase I results, as well as the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan, and crafted a series of goals and policies for its topic area.

- . Goals are intended to set a general direction by expressing our community's values and an ideal future end. They are not quantifiable or time-dependent, nor do they suggest specific steps for implementation.
- . Policies are broad statements which help guide decision making. They provide a context for setting priorities and for guiding the activities needed to achieve the goals,

After the topical subcommittees drafted their goals and policies, they were reviewed and revised by the Planning Committee as a whole. This was done to insure consistency and to make sure that all viewpoints were considered.

Community Check.in Fair (May 16, 1998)

The draft goals and policies for the Morgan Neighborhood Plan were presented at a Community "Check-in" Fair held May 16, 1998 at Gatewood School. The community was notified about this event with mailings, flyers posted throughout the business district and distributed at the Thriftway checkout stands, and a notice published in the West Seattle Herald. While attendance was disappointing (with only 76 people attending), there was significant acceptance of the goals and policies presented.

At this meeting, the Housing and Land-Use Committee gathered additional feedback on alternatives to the proposed Urban Village boundary, small-lot zoning, and design guidelines. The Parks Committee also used a survey to collect input on several specific ideas being considered for the Morgan Junction neighborhood,



Planning Recommendations

The final step in completion of the Neighborhood Plan was the creation of specific recommendations to be included in the Plan. The recommendations are a series of activities or action-specific statements and "can include:

- A specific action by the City, such as the enactment of an ordinance, adoption of a resolution, or construction of a public "facility.
- A list of steps to be undertaken by the community which are needed to complete a specific proposed project or setup an ongoing program.

Recommendations are captured in two places:

- . In the Neighborhood Plan itself, and
- In a document called the Approval and Adoption Matrix, which is a document used by City staff to review the Neighborhood Plan recommendations and identifies all the City's responses to the draft Plan. The final Approval and Adoption Matrix is that portion of the Plan which will be adopted into law by the City when our Neighborhood Plan is incorporated into the Seattle Comprehensive Plan.

Community Review of Recommendations (September 10, 1998)

Because the Planning Committee was disappointed by the May turnout, it decided to devote the MoCA general meeting of September 10, 1998 to a review of the recommendations in the hope that more community members would attend, learn about the Neighborhood Planning process, and provide additional input. An eight-page brochure was mailed to every household, institution and business in the Morgan Junction planning area to publicize this meeting and provide citizens with full information on the proposed goals, policies, and recommendations,

At this meeting, the draft recommendations were reviewed by the community, which was asked if the Organizing Committee had correctly captured the desires of the neighborhood in its prioritization of projects and actions. A total of 75 community members attended, and their responses provided additional input for the topical subcommittees to consider. The specific goals, policies, and recommendations are presented in the body of the plan and under Key Strategies below (beginning on page 29).

Graham Street Block Club Petition

At the September event, members of the Planning Committee were approached by a group of citizens who requested that the urban village boundary be changed to remove a one-block area from the village. They were asked to submit a petition describing exactly which area they wanted to remove from the village and their reasons for making the request. Shortly thereafter, the petition was received with 27 signatures representing 28 people. The petition was evaluated against four criteria to assess its impact on the intent of the Urban Village strategy and the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan:

- The signers of the petition must represent a majority of the properties in the affected area,
- The boundary revision must not adversely affect the compactness and talkability of the urban village or the centrality of the business district within the village,
- The boundary revision must not remove from the village any property zoned for multifamily or commercial development, and
- The boundary revision must not have a significant, adverse effect on the development capacity of the urban village.

Based on these criteria, the Planning Committee determined that the requested boundary change did not adversely affect the overall objectives of the Plan and thus accepted the proposed boundary revision and incorporated it into the final Draft Plan presented to the community for final validation. A COPY of the Graham Street Block Club petition and the analysis are included as attachments to this plan.

PLAN VALIDATION, NOVEMBER 1998

Validation of the Draft Plan took place during November, 1998. Early in the month, validation mailers were sent to all addresses in the Morgan Junction planning area. Additional publicity methods included : flyers and copies of the Draft Plan placed in the business district and in public places, flyers handed out at Thriftway during the week preceding the Validation Event, 15 campaign-style yard signs placed in high traffic areas throughout the Planning Area, a paid advertisement and public notices placed in the West Seattle Herald two weeks prior to the event, and extensive pre-event coverage by the Herald:

The Validation Event was held at Gatewood School from 10:00 a.m. to 400 p.m. on Saturday, November 21, 1998. 142 people signed in and 111 ballots were cast during the event. An additional 111 ballots were received by mail or at the West Seattle Town Hall by November 28th, for a total of 222 ballots.

Also at the Validation Event, two additional and separate surveys or "straw polls" were distributed by concerned citizens, the results of which are included in the Appendix.

On, several occasions between November 21, 1998 and January 14, 1999, the Planning Committee asked the people who conducted the straw poll to submit a written minority report or attachment to the plan which would describe their progress and findings, While oral summaries were presented at both a Planning Committee meeting and a MoCA general meeting, no formal report was ever submitted for incorporation into the Plan, Accordingly, the attachment to the Plan is limited to a copy of the straw poll questionnaire; a tabular summary of the results and the completed questionnaire.

Results and Modifications

Overall, the Draft Plan passed, receiving a majority (56 percent) of the votes, The proposed boundary change was also approved by 57 percent of the respondents, The Green Crescent Key Strategy was approved with a 55 percent "yes" vote; however, the Fauntleroy Way Key Strategy received only 39 percent approval.

All of the individual elements of the Plan were also approved, though the strength of support varied widely. Driven by support for a police precinct in West Seattle, the Public Safety element was the most popular, receiving over 80 percent approval. The Business District and Community/Culture elements received strong support, with 63 and 62 percent approval, respectively. The Housing/Land-Use and Transportation elements were approved, by slightly more than 54 percent of the respondents, while the Parks and Open Space element received only a one-vote plurality (50.2 percent approval).

The West Seattle-wide recommendations received 59 percent approval

A large number of written comments were also received, which proved invaluable in helping the Planning Committee identify and address specific concerns about the various elements of the Plan. The ballots and written comments were categorized by element and reviewed by each committee chair, who used them to develop responses and changes to the draft Plan. In addition, City responses to the Draft A & A Matrix were also considered at this time. A summary of the validation results is attached to this plan.

Eddy Street Ravine Petition

During the evaluation of the Validation Event results, the Planning Committee received a petition from 135 people concerned with inclusion of the Eddy Street Ravine and surrounding properties in the Neighborhood Plan. The petition requested that

- . The Urban Village boundary be shifted to the east, to exclude the ravine and all properties lying west of the business district (from Juneau Street to Fauntleroy Way) and Fauntleroy Way (south and west of California Avenue), and
- All references to the Eddy Street Ravine be removed from the Plan.

The requested boundary change was evaluated using the same criteria that were applied to the Graham Street Block Club petition. See page 26 for additional summary evaluation information. A full copy of the Eddy Street Ravine Petition analysis appears as an attachment to the Plan. The analysis recommended a compromise in which the bulk of the ravine and adjacent properties would be removed from the village boundary. In January 1999, negotiations were held with representatives of the petitioners over final delineation of the boundary and mutually acceptable revisions to the language in the Plan. A compromise was agreed to on January 11, 1999; the compromise boundary and plan language are now contained in the body of the Neighborhood Plan.

Final Modifications

Roughly summarized, the following changes were incorporated,

Urban Village Boundary

The Village boundary was shifted to the compromise location between the boundary advocated by the Eddy Street Ravine petitioners and the boundary validated at the November 21, 1998 event. With this change, a majority of the properties adjacent to the ravine were removed but the critical characteristics of the Urban Village were maintained. A map showing the final recommended village boundary appears in the Urban Village Boundary section of this plan,

Transportation and the Fauntleroy Way SW Improvement Key Strategy.

Based on the balloting and the comments received, the community does not accept a boulevard concept for Fauntleroy Way. References to studying and developing Fauntleroy Way SW as a landscaped two-lane boulevard were removed from the Plan. Greater emphasis was placed on pedestrian, bicycle and traffic safety, and maintaining roadway capacity and improving traffic flow.

Reference to neighborhood involvement with proposed traffic and Metro changes was also strengthened.

Parks and Open Space and the Green Crescent Key Strategy

A new policy was added to reflect concerns with maintenance and upkeep of existing and future Parks and Open Space areas, References to incorporating alleys into a bicycle route system were removed due to safety concerns, All negotiated compromise language from the January 11, 1999 meeting with the Eddy Street Ravine Preservation Alliance representatives was incorporated. References to the P-Patch were changed to Community Garden to reflect the full range of potential opportunities at that location. A clarifying street location was added to reflect information sent out in the Validation Mailer which had inadvertently been omitted from the Draft Plan. All reference to Fauntleroy Way SW as a boulevard was deleted.

Housing and Land Use

A statement was added saying that Single-Purpose Residential zoning not be adopted in the Urban Village, and that further study needs to be done. A policy and recommendation had reference to future RSL consideration removed, as future allowance was discussed in the body of the Plan, A recommendation to develop design guidelines for tandem housing, cottage housing and RSL was removed, as none are recommended for inclusion in the Plan.

Public Safety

Based on comments about concerns for safety in parks and open space areas, specific mention of police patrols in parks was added to the Plan. Slight changes in wording were made to bring the Plan in line with the City's concept of "emphasis patrols" instead of special patrols,

Business District

No changes were made

Community and Culture

No changes were made.

It's Our Plan

The Plan you hold in your hand is the result of the work of the Planning Committee and dozens of your fellow citizens over the past three years, These committees have been staffed by your neighbors, who have devoted thousands of hours of their personal time to draft a plan which they believe will allow our community to better withstand the impacts of growth over the next 20 years, allowing us to enhance the quality of life for all residents of the Morgan Junction neighborhood,

The process has been complex and not without controversy, Both the Committee and the City have been "learning as we go," and the evolving process frequently forced us to aim at moving targets. There is a diversity of opinions in our neighborhood, and many of these opinions are strongly held, The fact that the Neighborhood Plan was done at the behest of the City contributed to widespread skepticism about the integrity and ultimate outcome of the process,

Despite these difficulties, the Morgan Junction Planning Committee is encouraged to see the community get engaged in the planning process and contribute ideas and opinions that challenged

the Committee to create the best possible plan for the community as a whole. Prior to 1994, our community did not have a voice. Today, we not only have a plan, but also are laying the groundwork for a network of citizens that can provide us with permanent organized representation when dealing with the City, developers, or other forces which can affect the future of our community,

What's Next for MoCA?

MoCA is a grassroots association of property owners, residents, business persons, and other people who have a stake in the future of our neighborhood. These "stakeholders" are the heart of MoCA. Our primary purpose is to make the Morgan Junction a better place to live, work, shop, and enjoy.

Our goal is to continue in a stewardship role as after the Morgan Junction Neighborhood Plan is approved and its recommendations are considered for implementation. MoCA intends to evolve into a permanent community council to represent the interests of our neighborhood and help oversee and facilitate implementation of the Plan and its recommendations. Quite obviously, it is advantageous for our neighborhood to have organized representation when dealing with the City on planning, zoning, and capital improvement matters that affect our community. It is equally obvious that a broad and diverse organization better represents the entire community. To this end, MoCA will continue to actively recruit new members,

Community Outreach Will Continue

As details of projects and specific recommendations are developed in the future, the community will have a better opportunity to visualize and understand them. On some of the major projects presented during our planning outreach, concern has been expressed that the details were arrived at without full consultation with the community, particularly neighbors who might be directly affected.

While the MoCA Planning Committee realizes that we will not gain complete community consensus on some projects and recommendations, we want to emphasize that we will adhere to the following principles:

- No project or recommendation shall go forward without significant direct outreach to those community members that we can identify as being directly affected. For example, if a park is proposed, any studies or design work *must* include efforts to reach out to and involve the owners and occupants of all adjoining properties.
- No Neighborhood Planning project shall go forward without consultation and review by the neighbors, MoCA, and the City,

The Plan

The following pages contain the body of the Morgan Junction Neighborhood Plan, It is organized into three major sections:

1. A discussion of the changes to the urban village boundary recommended in the Plan.
2. A discussion of the two Key Strategies presented in the plan
 - . The "Green Crescent"
 - . Fauntleroy Way Pedestrian Safety and Landscaping Improvements
3. The last section presents separate discussions of each of the elements in our plan:
 - . Parks and Open Space
 - .
 - Transportation and Traffic
 - Business "District
 - Housing and Land-Use
 - . Public Safety
 - . Community and Culture

Each of these sections presents the background, goals, policies, and recommendations for each of the elements of the plan.